ORIGINAL

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
v.	No. 4:11-CR-153-A
CHRISTOPHER TURRENTINE	

GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR EARLY TERMINATION OF SUPERVISED RELEASE

The United States of America, by and through the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Texas, files this Response to the defendant's Motion for Early Termination of Supervised Release:

The defendant was sentenced to a 3-year term of supervised release. He has currently served just under two years, or less than two-thirds, of that term. In support of his motion, the defendant asserts that he has complied with all of the conditions of his release, has been making restitution payments as ordered, and has maintained gainful employment.

The defendant argues that the travel restrictions that are part of his conditions of release create a burden on him because his job requires travel in order to advance. Specifically, the defendant claims that his ability to engage in "networking" is hampered by his "inability to make snap-travel decision[s]."

The defendant's compliance with his conditions of release is laudable. However, compliance with the terms of supervised release should be expected and should not serve as grounds for early termination. Compliance is required to avoid revocation, and should not been seen as an exceptional accomplishment. The defendant points to no circumstances or accomplishments beyond mere compliance with his conditions that would justify an early release.

Likewise, one of the defendant's conditions of release is the repayment of restitution. While he states that she has complied with that condition, if his term of supervised release is terminated early, his incentives to continue making such payments will diminish. While the defendant claims that he expects a civil action to be initiated against him to enforce the restitution judgment, the consequences of non-payment of such a civil judgment are not as severe as the threat of revocation of a term of supervised release. Thus, the termination of supervised release may reduce the ability to collected court-ordered restitution.

Finally, based on his motion, the only condition of release that presents a burden to the defendant is the restriction on travel. The government, therefore, would not oppose some modification to the defendant's travel restriction to accommodate his need to make "snap-travel decision[s]." Apart from that accommodation, however, the government believes that supervised release has been serving its intended function in the defendant's case, and should be continued for its intended duration. For these reasons, the government opposes the defendant's motion for early termination of supervised release.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN R. PARKER
UNITED STATES OF ATTORNEY

JAY WEIMER
Assistant United States Attorney
State Bar of Texas #24013727
Burnett Plaza, Suite 1700
801 Cherry Street, Unit 4
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6882
Telephone: 817-252-5200
Facsimile: 817-252-5455

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on November 9, 2016, the foregoing Government's Response to the PSR was served by hand-delivery to the United States Probation Office, U.S. Courthouse, 501 W. 10th Street, Fort Worth, Texas 76102 and by first class mail to the *pro se* defendant.

JAY WEIMER
Assistant United States Attorney